

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents conclusions of the study and some recommendation. The conclusions are drawn based on the data analysis which is discussed in Chapter four and underpinned by theories in Chapter two of this study. Some recommendations are provided in order to give information as well as guidance to conduct further study concerning the similar issue.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

This study attempts to answer two research questions of how Reading to Learn is implemented to teach writing of hortatory exposition text and what improvements can be identified as a result of the program's implementation. Using descriptive qualitative design in a case study, the participants were thirty four students of eleventh grade in one of high middle school in Cimahi. However, following the notion of R2L, only six selected students become the focus participants, each two of whom represented low, middle, and high achieved learners. This aims to seek the equal abilities among those students after being intervened by this program (Rose, 2016c).

Related to the first research question about how R2L was implemented, it was revealed that the core elements which were included in the four major stages of this program are decisive factors in determining successful implementation. They are learning cycle, teacher-student interaction, and strategies. Those elements that become special characteristics of R2L were inevitably emerged when applying each of the stages. The first stage known as Preparing for Reading was proved to give the students' background knowledge of the issue. The second stage, Detailed Reading, could evidently provide the students' complete understanding about the text through recognizing the language patterns. The third stage called Joint Rewriting was able to assist the students to make persuasive argument and the last stage, Joint Construction, facilitated the students to practice writing a hortatory exposition text. In other words, there were merely three stages that highlighted the learning process in this study. The fourth stage was more

considered as post intervention activity to seek students' output after conducting the program.

To answer the second research question concerning the students' writing improvements, the researcher initiated it by analyzing the students' diagnostic test. The finding showed the students' problems were to do with context, discourse, grammar, and graphic analysis. The main problems related to the context among others are poor arguments, the existence of contrastive arguments, incoherent description and point of view, lack of persuasive resources such as grounds, evidence or examples. Furthermore, the major problem involved with discourse analysis was limited knowledge of related vocabularies. Meanwhile, the noticeable result of grammar analysis pointed out the incorrect pattern of passive sentences and disagreement between subject and verb. To end the analysis, inappropriate spelling and punctuation were other priority problems identified.

In line with the problems revealed in the diagnostic test, the significant improvements in term of the context were a greater number of arguments, coherent description and point of view, and numerous persuasive resources. Besides, the use of more various conjunction and coherent lexical choice signified the improvements in the context of discourse. Although correct pattern of passive sentences and appropriate spelling indicated the improvements in the scope of grammar and graphic layout, inappropriate punctuation, and incorrect use of subject-verb agreement showed fair enhancement in the context of graphic layout and grammar.

It was assumed that the students' improvements on the field scope were mostly related to the Preparing for Reading stage. Student's background knowledge about the issue enabled them to describe the issue and point of view coherently (field).

Moreover, the stage of Detailed Reading and Joint Rewriting were considered to improve the students' writing in term of the grammar and discourse including lexis appraisal, and conjunction. The students' analysis toward the language pattern of the model text developed their abilities to notice the use of factual terms and the way of using words (lexis), the use of word choice used to evoke emotion (appraisal), the use of connective words (conjunction) and grammar. In the

context scope, the students were able to give appropriate phases of description, examples, evidence; to have appropriate level of persuasive resources (mode) so that their arguments could be convincing (tenor) and their writing would achieve the purpose (genre).

The other students' improvements regarding graphic features including spelling and punctuation attempted to be developed in the three stages of Preparing for Reading, Detailed Reading, and Joint Rewriting

In conclusion, the implementation of Reading to Learn program could improve students' writing of hortatory exposition text encompassing both genre, generic structure, language features generally and context, discourse, grammar, graphic particularly.

## 5.2 Recommendations

In accordance with the topic discussed which is about the implementation of Reading to Learn program in the teaching hortatory exposition, several possible recommendations are promoted for further researchers and practitioners.

First, it is recommended that R2L be carried out to improve students' writing in other genres and skills since the scope of R2L implementation in this study was restricted only on teaching hortatory exposition genre. Besides, in R2L different strategies are formulated for different genre of text.

Second, it is worth trying to apply R2L as an effort to increase not only writing but also reading, speaking, and listening skills in the context of middle school in Indonesia as EFL country. In fact, R2L implementation process much relied on teacher student interaction, learning cycle in which the teacher must always be prepared to give task and to elaborate, and strategies conducted in each stage as key points of this program. Therefore, it is possible for further researchers to apply R2L as an effort to enhance other skills of language.

Third, having been recommended by previous researcher concerning time matter, the researcher suggests conducting this program in longer period of time. The stages of argumentative teaching consisted of Preparing for Reading, Detailed Reading, Joint Rewriting, and Joint Construction tend to take much time to be implemented. As a participant observer who is not the school teacher, the

researcher gained time limitation in implementing this program. This caused the process of data collection become less flexible and free. Neither could the researcher completely maximize the students' potentials to enhance their writing abilities nor the students show significant improvements in all assessment writing criteria proposed by Rose (2016c). Thus, it is suggested to spare more time in implementing Reading to Learn to obtain more satisfying result both for the teacher, the researcher and the students so that R2L can be one of the alternatives to more effective genre based teaching.